

IN THE CLAIMS:

In line 3 of claim 9, substitute -aromatic- for "acromatic".

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Gosens et al., Yang et al. And Buysch et al.

The examiner states that each of the resins teaches the use of a Teflon/aromatic phosphate flame retardant system for polycarbonate resins which contains either an ABS resin or an ABS/SAN resin blend. The examiner further states that the ranges of relative of amounts of ingredients claimed in the present application are within the purview of the references and that use of ABS resin in an amount sufficient to provide the expected benefit of improving impact resistance is *prima facie* obvious.

Applicants wish to point out that the rejection of claim 1 appears to be in error, since claim 1 should have been canceled by entry of the Preliminary Amendment of April 27, 1997.

Applicants acknowledge that the references cited by the examiner generically disclose combinations of aromatic polycarbonate resin, vinyl-aromatic-unsaturated nitrile-diene rubber graft copolymer, vinyl aromatic-unsaturated nitrile rigid resin, phosphate and tetrafluoroethylene polymer. However, applicants submit that the references fail to disclose or suggest combining those ingredients in the relative amounts claimed in the present application and that the references would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to expect that combining the ingredients set forth in claims 9 and 10 of the present application in the relative amounts set forth in